

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, and 10 have been amended. New claims 17-19 have been added. Claims 4 and 9 have been canceled. After entry of the present amendments, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-19 remain pending for further examination.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,510,464 (Grantges et al.).

An embodiment of Applicants' invention is directed to a scheme that allows inbound access requests to be made into an intranet from the internet across a firewall that allows only outbound requests from the intranet through the interaction of a publisher on the intranet and a listener outside a firewall on the internet. According to an embodiment of Applicants' invention, the listener "tricks" the publisher into accepting a would-be "inbound access request" (that would otherwise be disallowed) by embedding the access request into the listener's *response* to the communication request from the publisher. In other words, the publisher on the intranet side solicits requests from the listener on the internet side and does not require any inbound HTTP or HTTPS requests to be supported or provided by the publisher. Traditional firewalls keep open only the outbound ports (such as HTTP and HTTPS) and disallow all inbound requests. Applicants' invention does not require that any other incoming or outgoing port be opened in the firewall.

By contrast, Grantges et al.'s proposed system teaches precisely what aspects of Applicants' invention sought to avoid—requiring that another port on the firewall be open to inbound requests, rendering it more vulnerable. It does so by interposing a gateway proxy server on the intranet that is connected across a firewall to a DMZ proxy server on the internet. The DMZ proxy server sends inbound messages (which are disallowed in aspects of Applicants' invention) through a port in the firewall to the internal gateway proxy server. *See, e.g.*, Abstract; col. 2, ll. 65-66; col. 4, ll. 49-52; col. 6, ll. 47-51; col. 9, ll. 1-5 ("Plug-in 36 associated with DMZ proxy server 34 is configured to extract the digital certificate from the incoming message and pass it to gateway proxy server 40 in an HTTP header, **as part of an HTTPS message 72.**"); col. 9, ll. 19-20 ("Client computer 22 requests, by way of message 76, resources from gateway web server 44."); col. 9, ll. 30-32 ("DMZ proxy server 34 routes message 80 [*i.e.*, an

HTTPS command], based on the composite URL, to gateway proxy server in a message 82.”). Grantges et al.’s firewall explicitly allows inbound messages from the insecure network into the secure intranet: “In this regard, firewall system 32 restricts communication originating from the insecure network 26, only **allowing passage of messages destined for application gateway 38 on the private network (e.g., gateway proxy server 40).**” Col. 5, ll. 48-52.

Turning now to the claims as amended, Applicants respectfully submit that they are patentable over Grantges et al. for at least the reason that Grantges et al. does not teach or disclose embedding internet user access requests within a listener’s responses to communication responses from a publisher. The Office Action cites the entire patent, col. 3, l. 63 to col. 16, l. 4, as allegedly teaching claims 4 and 9; however, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere does Grantges teach or disclose embedding internet user access requests within a listener’s responses to communication responses from a publisher. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, he is kindly requested to indicate in the next official communication by specific column and line citation precisely where Grantges discloses each element of the claims as amended.

Finally, claim 10 calls for, *inter alia*, “encapsulating said access request in a response message.” For at least the same reasons with respect to claims 1 and 6 (as amended), Grantges et al. does not teach or disclose encapsulating, on the internet side of a firewall, internet user access requests in a response message.

The respective claims that depend from claims 1, 6, and 10 are believed to be patentable over Grantges et al. for at least the reason that the respective independent claims from which they depend are patentable thereover.


Application No. 10/717750
Amendment dated May 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of February 14, 2006

Docket No.: 47181-00276USPT

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Justin D. Swindells", is written over a horizontal line.

Justin D. Swindells,

Registration No.: 48,733

JENKENS & GILCHRIST

225 West Washington Street, Suite 2600

Chicago, Illinois 60606-3418

312-425-3900 (telephone)

312-425-3909 (facsimile)

Attorneys For Applicant